

REMARKS

Applicant thanks the Examiner for participating in the interview held on February 20, 2007. The subject matter of the original claim 1 was discussed and, at the Examiner's initiative, a possible amendment of the independent claim involving the subject matter of dependent claim 10 was briefly discussed. It was agreed that Applicant would consider an amendment along those lines.

In response to the office action dated November 27, 2006, Applicants are amending claims 1, 4, 10, 11, 14, 19 and 21. As such, claims 1-21 are pending, of which claims 1 and 14 are independent claims. Favorable consideration of the amended claims is requested.

Claim 1 is being amended to recite "receiving priority information specifying an order in which the plurality of preconfigured automated diagnostic procedures is to be performed in the computer system, the priority information reflecting dependencies between the automated diagnostic procedures" and "receiving user input to modify the priority information to specify where in relation to the specified order to perform the first user-developed automated diagnostic procedure". Moreover, claim 1 is being amended to recite that after receiving the executable program instructions and the user input, the program is executed according to the modified priority information. These amendments are supported by the present disclosure, for example in the description of priority information on page 14, line 14—page 24, line 3 (hereafter referred to thus: 14:14—24:3), and in the description of user-defined procedures, 27:11—30:22.

Corresponding changes are being made in independent claim 14, which is a computer program product claim. Dependent claim 4 is being amended to correct an informality. Dependent claim 10 is being amended to recite that "the priority information comprises a matrix with dependency values for the automated diagnostic procedures", that "one of the dependency values indicates a correlation probability between two of the automated diagnostic procedures" and further "deciding a relative order of the two automated diagnostic procedures based on the correlation probability if the correlation probability is at least a threshold value". Moreover, dependent claim 11 is being amended to recite that there is received another user input "doing at least one selected from the group consisting of: specifying a correlation probability between two of the

automated diagnostic procedures, selecting a correlation probability between two of the automated diagnostic procedures not to be updated, modifying the specified order, and combinations thereof". Similar amendments are made in dependent claims 19 and 21. Each of these amendments is supported by the description of priority information. 14:14—24:3 No new matter is added.

In the office action, dependent claim 4 was objected to because of an informality. Applicant is correcting claim 4 by amendment and asks that the objection be removed.

Claims 14-21 were rejected under § 101 due to the term "information carrier". Applicant is amending these claims to instead use the term "machine-readable storage device" which was suggested in the office action. Accordingly, applicants ask that the rejection be removed. Applicant does not concede that the rejection has merit.

Claims 1-4 and 14-15 were rejected under § 102(b) as being anticipated by WO01/18652 ("Cha"). Claim 5 was rejected under § 103(a) as being obvious over Cha in view of U.S. 20040078692 ("Jackson"). Claims 6, 10, 11, 19 and 21 were rejected under § 103(a) as being obvious over Cha in view of U.S. 20030131290 ("Weinberg"). Claims 7-9 and 16-18 were rejected under § 103(a) as being obvious over Cha in view of WO97/15009 ("Bajpai"). Claims 12, 13 and 20 were rejected under § 103(a) as being obvious over Cha and Weinberg in view of Bajpai.

These rejections are rendered moot by the amendments of the claims. However, Applicant will point to differences between the present subject matter and the references.

Claim 1 now recites that "priority information specifying an order in which the plurality of preconfigured automated diagnostic procedures is to be performed in the computer system" is received, the priority information "reflecting dependencies between the automated diagnostic procedures" and that there is received "user input to modify the priority information to specify where in relation to the specified order to perform the first user-developed automated diagnostic procedure". Moreover, claim 1 recites that after the executable program instructions and the user input are received, the program is executed according to the modified priority information. As such, the method recited in claim 1 lets a user add a user-developed automated diagnostic

procedure to a program that performs predefined automated diagnostic procedures, and the user can modify the priority information for the order of performing the automated diagnostic procedures. Applicant submits that the cited references do not disclose or suggest a method where, when a user-developed automated diagnostic procedure is added, priority information reflecting dependencies between the automated diagnostic procedures is modified to accommodate the user-developed automated diagnostic procedure.

Cha discloses method and apparatus for implementing an expandable network based expert system. Cha title. Cha states that "Users may create their own specific diagnostics. Diagnostics may be created and shared by importing and exporting diagnostic definitions." Cha 15:23-25. Cha also describes that the user selects the "diagnostic pull-down menu" and uses it to specify a diagnostic group to run. Cha 14:5-19 (Cha Figure 9). So in Cha, it is apparently the user who decides which diagnostic to run, and Cha does not appear to contemplate any reordering of the diagnostics within the group. As such, Cha does not seem to disclose or suggest the use of priority information for automated diagnostic procedures, and the Examiner appears to have acknowledged this by the statement "Cha fails to teach ordering of diagnostic procedures". Office Action page 7. Rather, the Examiner cited Weinberg for such subject matter. But Weinberg also does not disclose the use of priority information as recited in the present claims.

Weinberg discloses a software system and methods for testing transactional servers. Weinberg title. Generally, Weinberg describes that a test is created by planning the test, recording a user's interactions with a transactional server, performing verification, and optionally performing a data drive step. Weinberg 0050-0052. The steps performed by the user can be represented as a node in a tree. Weinberg 0061. But Weinberg does not teach or suggest that priority information for automated diagnostic procedures should reflect dependencies between the procedures, or that a user input should modify such priority information for a user-developed procedure, as recited in the present claims. As such, Applicants submit that Cha and Weinberg, taken alone or in combination, do not anticipate or suggest the present subject matter.

Jackson and Bajpai were cited against other features in the original set of claims, and the Examiner did not contend that they disclose or suggest the use of priority information as recited in the present claims. However, Applicant is not conceding that the Examiner's characterization of any of the references is correct.

It is believed that all of the pending claims have been addressed. However, the absence of a reply to a specific rejection, issue or comment does not signify agreement with or concession of that rejection, issue or comment. In addition, because the arguments made above may not be exhaustive, there may be reasons for patentability of any or all pending claims (or other claims) that have not been expressed. Finally, nothing in this paper should be construed as an intent to concede any issue with regard to any claim, except as specifically stated in this paper, and the amendment of any claim does not necessarily signify concession of unpatentability of the claim prior to its amendment.

This response is filed within the shortened statutory period and no fee is therefore due. Please apply any other charges or credits to deposit account 06-1050.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: _____

2/26/07



J. Richard Soderberg
Reg. No. 43,352

Fish & Richardson P.C.
60 South Sixth Street
Suite 3300
Minneapolis, MN 55402
Telephone: (612) 335-5070
Facsimile: (612) 288-9696